

1964

leagues to the bill I have sponsored—H.R. 10211 in this House—legislation which is identical with that introduced in the other body by Senator KEATING—S. 2432, seeking to correct these conditions.

Both my bill and that of Senator KEATING call for the establishment of a commission to make a comprehensive study and investigation of the adequacy of the present system of compulsory military training for the purpose of suggesting corrective legislation to meet the needs of present-day military manpower requirements.

Draft law reform is increasingly imperative, Mr. Speaker, and this has been effectively highlighted in the New York World-Telegram series, the concluding article of which I now, under unanimous consent, place in the Appendix of the RECORD, together with a forthright, hard-hitting editorial that appeared in the same newspaper calling for drastic and realistic changes in the draft law:

**DRAFT REFORM LIKELY, CHARGES OF UNFAIRNESS MOUNTS**  
(By Lee Townsend)

"A rickety, wasteful, and completely unfair system of filling the ranks of the Army."  
—Senator WAYNE MORSE.

"The present system has too long been extended as a matter of course."  
—Senator KENNETH KEATING.

Faced with mounting evidence that the peacetime draft is unfair, Washington is finally taking a hard look at the Nation's highly selective system of Selective Service.

In rapid succession this month, President Johnson and the Pentagon took steps that might lead to the first major reforms in the postwar draft since its inception 15 years ago.

And yesterday, five Republican Senators, among them KENNETH KEATING, Republican, of New York, joined to introduce a bill calling for a review of the draft laws.

"The present system has been too long extended as a matter of course," KEATING said. "Some of the present inequities in the draft system have been called to my attention by an ever-increasing number of letters from New York State and other parts of the country."

The President ordered induction examination to be given, wherever possible, as soon as youths reach the age of 18 instead of at the age of 22 or 23, which is the current practice.

The White House hopes that early detection of disabilities will lead to corrective measures. And this, it is hoped, will lead to a reduction in the number of 3.5 million draft-age Americans who so far have managed to escape military service because they are "unfit."

Just last week the Pentagon announced a sweeping study of the draft with an eye to major reforms. The brass gave no hint about what steps might be taken to improve the Selective Service System but made it clear there was little chance the draft would be abolished.

Defense experts argue that, in order to scrap conscription entirely, the size of our Armed Forces would have had to undergo a sizable reduction—and no such reduction is anticipated. In fact, most officials seem to feel that it would be impossible to think of a nation getting by without some form of conscription—even though this country never had a peacetime draft before 1940, Canada still doesn't have it, and England got rid of it in 1960.

The Nation's elaborate Selective Service currently can take credit for providing only about 7 percent of America's military force of 2.7 million.

And up to half of the 200,000 draftees are actually volunteers. These are men who ask that their names be pushed up on the draft list, usually because they figure, rightly or not, that military service is inevitable and so they might as well get it over with.

Conscription has been cited for bolstering our Armed Forces indirectly by bulldozing men into the Army, Navy, Marines, and Air Force to avoid a draft notice. But with enlistment periods for all services usually set at 3 years, there's no evidence that men have flocked to recruiting stations in great numbers just to avoid a 2-year stint as a draftee.

**RESERVE VERSUS DRAFT**

It is generally conceded, however, that the Army Reserve program, in which men may fulfill their active duty military requirements in 6 months, has thrived solely as a substitute for the draft.

Local Selective Service authorities point out that an important part of their job is to provide a pool of readily available men in case of national emergency.

They say many men, who now are "better serving their country" with deferments and exemptions can be called into uniform in time of need.

Yet during the Berlin crisis in 1961, tens of thousands of reservists—among them former draftees—were called back to duty because there was not time to draft and train new men.

At one point, the Army admitted that more than 1,000 of these men were recalled erroneously.

Although draft calls increased sharply during the crisis, there was a serious question raised as to how successful Selective Service is in delivering men to meet the instant emergencies of the atomic age.

The vital questions about the effectiveness of Selective Service were not answered when the fourth extension of the draft law swept through both Houses of Congress last March.

In fact they were hardly asked.

The House of Representatives debated mainly whether the life of the law should be reduced from 4 to 2 years. It wasn't.

The Senate didn't even handle this issue. Debate there took two pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and about 10 minutes.

Oregon Senator WAYNE MORSE delivered the only real blast against the peacetime draft. He said, "Selective Service remains just as discriminatory in its selection as before, and just as unfair to the young men of the Nation."

"It is astonishing to me that in a Pentagon building with the so-called whiz kids and slide ruler minds that pride themselves on industrial efficiency, we must still stagger along with a rickety, wasteful and completely unfair system of filling the ranks of the Army."

**WIDER SCOPE EXPECTED**

The Selective Service Director, Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, and Col. Paul Akst, New York City draft chief, have indicated that reforms are likely to expand the scope of the Selective Service System, not reduce it.

For instance, draft experts here feel more should be done to divert many skilled men, now deferred or exempt, to useful positions in the military or in national industry. Such provisions now are made in the case of doctors, who are called into service when there is a need for them.

One high draft official said, "Such a policy would aid in balancing the scales in the minds of persons who do not qualify for deferment before age 26 and enter military service."

It also has been proposed that men be

drafted right after high school rather than in their early 20's, as is usually done now. Representative ALBERT H. QUIE, of Minnesota, pointed out, "We are drafting men between 23 and 26 with jobs and leaving younger men without jobs."

So far, most reforms are strictly talk. And the draft forecast for the near future remains: Good luck for the many, tough break for the few.

There is no guarantee that the forecast won't be the same in 1967, when the Universal Military Training and Service Act comes up again for passage \* \* \* and the first babies born under peacetime conscription start trying to beat the draft.

**CHANGE THE DRAFT**

Can anything be done about the awful tragedy of the draft?

In a nation that believes in equal opportunity, in equal sacrifice, in equal sharing of the responsibilities as well as the benefits of citizenship, the draft is a dangerous joke.

It is riddled with favoritism and class. Instead of creating a proud democratic tradition of service, it is something to be avoided by any means, fair or foul.

Those who finally serve feel they are victims rather than standard bearers. What this does to their morale and to the moral fabric of this country is inexcusably sad.

The draft, as it is now constituted, cannot be tolerated by any citizen with a shred of patriotism.

For some years, this newspaper has advocated genuine universal military service. For everybody.

If there is a physical barrier to serving in the Armed Forces, let the young citizen participate in some civilian service for his country.

Everyone should do his part. That is the basis of true universal military service.

But weak politicians have built a thick coating of privilege around the draft. As Reporter Lee Townsend dramatically showed in his series in this paper last week, the draft today is a mockery of decency.

There is even grave question of the need of any draft. Only 7 percent of the Nation's Armed Forces come from the ironically named Selective Service.

Whether the services can get enough men without conscription is, however, a military and not a civilian problem.

The draft itself is up to all of us.

There are positive developments in the making. President Johnson has expressed alarm over the high rate of rejection of young citizens and has ordered an investigation.

Most significant recent move is that of Senator KEATING, of New York, who is asking a complete inquiry into every phase of the draft mess.

These two investigations, executive and legislative, need top priority. We hope interested citizens of all ages write their Senators and Congressmen to speed the inquiry.

There are so many things wrong with the draft that almost anything would be an improvement.

Now, for instance, would be a good time for all judges who have added to disrespect for the military by sending delinquents into service instead of jail, to stop this ridiculous practice.

And now also, it might be wise for the old draft leadership in Washington, the officers who ran the system during World War II, to step down and give a fresh point of view a chance.

The draft must not be allowed to continue the way it is.

Even as we all seek improvements to make the draft a tool of government rather than its master, young Americans are dying in Vietnam and Panama.

March 11

**We Must Understand Our Own System if  
We Are To Defeat Communism****EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. BRUCE ALGER**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 11, 1964*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the only way freedom will lose out to communism in the world struggle is if the people do not understand our own system of private enterprise, capitalism. Our greatest strength is that we are a free nation in which every person may rise to whatever heights his own initiative and ambition carry him, yet how many are there in America today who fail to understand the most fundamental facts as to what our Republic is and how it functions?

Mr. Speaker, if we are to survive in the world struggle the American people must become knowledgeable. If we are not to be ruled, we must rule.

Washington Columnist Henry J. Taylor wrote an excellent article on this subject which was reprinted in *The Washington Post* of March 16, 1964.

The reprint follows:

**POLITICAL PUSHOVERS**

(Editor's Note.—Since the following comments by Washington Columnist Henry J. Taylor are reflective of identical editorial thought on the part of *Washington World*, we share our quill this week with Mr. Taylor.)

While two out of three American colleges and universities do not require the study of American history and most don't require it for entrance, we say we're a nation prepared to defend its heritage and liberties.

We're to outlast the indoctrinations of the Soviet Union like that. We'll be lucky if the bottom doesn't fall out of our boat.

Moreover, 1 out of 4 teachers' colleges fail to require any study of American history and more than half ignore it even for entrance.

We always need more buildings, more personnel, more money for education—but what kind of education? No wonder there are inroads against loyalty to our country, appreciation of what we have here and the sacrifices for which we are indebted evermore. Our Republic stands firmly on four cornerstones:

One. The Bill of Rights—government by law with respect for the individual versus the state or crown. Men died to give us that liberty. Other legions died to preserve it. We are their heirs. They have no other heirs but ourselves. But you have to understand American history to understand this.

Two. A broad moral code which involves individual responsibility based on the precept that one man's rights end where another's rights begin. But you have to understand American history to understand this heritage.

Three. The opportunity for individual accomplishments. The primary factor in American life is our self-faith.

Out of self-faith, out of a clear vision and an unshakable confidence in his heart, the American man believes he can stand up to his times. His credit is character. His funds are faith and hard work. His purposes is the American way of life. But there are no fixed and frozen classes here. As millions advance, they bring other millions up with them. But you have to understand Ameri-

can history to see why making our Government sound like the people's keeper is reactionary, not liberal.

Four. A basic education of all citizens so that we may better assume the responsibilities of free citizens in a representative democracy. Yet, how can this be possible if we are not required to understand the story of the birth and development of this Nation, unique in all the world, and its consequences?

The best counteroffensive to communism is a thorough understanding of American history. Socialism? There is a great difference between being social-minded and being socialist. Many note that difference is eroded now by too much emphasis on personal rights and not enough on personal responsibility.

As one result, we are a pushover for political oratory and excessive taxation. We contemplate healing the world while we are not decently governing ourselves.

We are faced by Communist enemy powers indoctrinating their own youth with an attack on all we hold dear. They achieve this relentlessly in the merciless, mechanized robotlike (but successful) voice of the fanatic.

In our essential counterattack, it would be helpful if alumni—state and private—wrote the deans to ask if American history is a required subject for either entrance or graduation, or both, and if not, why not, and when, at long last, it is going to be required.

**South Vietnam Gag****EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 11, 1964*

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the American public is naturally concerned with the recurring complications in Vietnam. They should be properly informed of the policy in that country in relationship to our overall foreign and defense position.

The *Chicago Sun-Times*, in an editorial of Sunday, March 8, very properly questioned the absence of sufficient information to evaluate the South Vietnamese situation, and I place the editorial into the RECORD at this point for the attention of the Members:

**SOUTH VIETNAM GAG**

For the second time in 10 months a gag has been applied to military personnel serving in South Vietnam.

The latest muzzle instructs the military to say nothing detrimental about the new government in South Vietnam. The order was issued just prior to Defense Secretary Robert F. McNamara's departure from Washington for Saigon.

Last June an order went out from the U.S. Continental Army Command instructing military personnel in South Vietnam to say only good things about the war in that area.

The truth is hard to come by in South Vietnam. The governments there—any of the three recent governments—have made a habit of avoiding the truth. Information from the U.S. military has, in the past, been a balance against which the government statement is could be weighed.

What Gen. Paul D. Harkins, commander of the American Forces in Vietnam, has to

fear that would cause him to circulate yet another military gag order is not known.

The basic truth about South Vietnam is pretty well established. The United States is in an unholy mess in that area and it is not the fault of the military forces of the United States.

The fault lies with the politicians and foreign policy experts who put the military into an impossible situation, jeopardize their mission with vacillating policy and then try to fool everyone by saying things are going well.

**Chain Saw Treatment for Castro****EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. DONALD RUMSFELD**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1964*

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, a *Chicago Sun-Times* editorial of March 5 suggests that the water incident at Guantanamo indicates that if there is the will Castro and Communists in general can be effectively dealt with. I agree with the views expressed in this editorial and submit it for inclusion in the RECORD:

**CHAIN SAW TREATMENT FOR CASTRO**

Fidel Castro now says he's willing to turn the water back on at the U.S. naval base at Guantanamo. He should be ignored. This water episode should serve as an example of the proper way to deal with him and the Communist problem in Cuba.

The best thing that any American has done concerning Cuba in the past few weeks was the action of Guantanamo's commander, Adm. John D. Bulkeley. When Castro ordered the water valve closed in retaliation for the arrest in Florida of some poaching Cuban fishermen, Adm. Bulkeley ordered the water pipe cut with a chain saw.

The action was a dramatic way of showing that the United States does not need anything from Castro, not even water for the naval base on Cuba. The reverse is true. Cuba needs the good will and help of the United States and the free world. Castro wants to turn the Gltmo water back on because he needs the revenue he gets from it. He needs the foreign exchange from wages paid Cuban workers on the base. When he cut the water, this payroll was cut in half.

Castro not only wants to sell water to Gltmo, he says that in return for trade arrangements he is willing to start paying for some of the foreign properties he grabbed when he turned Cuba Communist. Big deal.

Castro is somewhat in the position of a thief who fell down a well while running away with a farmer's prize pig. He says he's willing to pay for the pig if the farmer will pull him out of the well. For Castro is deep down an economic well.

Cuba's economy is sagging. Cuba has pledged deliveries of sugar, including long-range commitments to the Soviet Union, that one economist has figured out amounts to more than double expected production. Cubans are being promised shoes and clothing—not cash—to induce them to help in the harvests. This indicates an extreme shortage of consumer goods. "Che" Guevara, the imported Communist mastermind, admitted as much recently.

"The people are constantly asking for food, shoes, clothing, all the consumer goods necessary to life," he said in a radio speech monitored in Miami. "A balance must be struck."

The balance Castro has in mind would be struck by getting help through trade from the productive nations of the world. That is why he seeks trade. The answer of the free world should be "no." The economic noose should be tightened until Castro and his Communist cohorts are overthrown. Help from the free world merely sustains him while he makes Communist subversive warfare on the free world. While Castro shorts his own people he has funds to spend fomenting trouble in other Latin American countries. Only last December, the same Che Guevara boasted that Cuban saboteurs and money were being used to overthrow seven Latin American countries.

Venezuela has proved her case before the Organization of American States that Cuba landed a supply of arms on the Venezuelan coast as part of a plot to overthrow the constitutional government. Castroite activity was obvious in the Panama turmoil. A plot to overthrow the Government of Honduras was uncovered last month.

Castro tries to divert attention from all this by his bland pretension that he wants and deserves normal trade relations.

Gov. William W. Scranton, of Pennsylvania, a possibility for the Republican presidential nomination, had an answer for this in an Associated Press interview Monday. He proposed a strict quarantine including, if necessary, the use of force to cut off Russian oil shipments to Cuba.

The next day, former Vice President Richard M. Nixon said much the same thing. The United States, Nixon said, should impose a selective embargo on foreign companies that do business with Cuba; the United States must do what is necessary to bring Castro down, "short of invasion and blockade." Nixon added that a naval blockade to shut off Soviet oil might become necessary later.

Scranton and Nixon are saying things that must be said. The American people have shown they will back up a tough policy toward Castro. They showed it when President Kennedy moved to the brink of war over Cuba in 1962. They showed it in their reaction to Admiral Bulkeley's chain saw answer to Castro.

The United States and its allies must apply the chain saw treatment to Castro. Scranton, Nixon, and Senator Barry Goldwater have spoken plainly about Cuba. It is time President Johnson did, too.

### The Farm Work Force

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1964

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the January 25 issue of the Frederick (Md.) Post carried an editorial on the farm work force. I believe this information on the unemployment situation in our farm communities will be of interest to my colleagues in the Congress.

The editorial follows:

[From the Frederick (Md.) Post, Jan. 25, 1964]

#### THE FARM WORK FORCE

On the American farm, it is not simply unemployment as it is in the rest of the economy, it is shrinking employment. Employment that will not be recovered, for farm production is rising with less and less workers every year.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture figures for the past year confirm this conclusion only too well. For 1963, the farm labor averaged 6,519,000 workers—well below the 5-year average (1957-61) of 7,284,000. It was also a drop of 200,000 from 1962.

The 1963 farm work force was made up of 4,736,000 family members—farm operators and family members working without wages—and 1,783,000 hired workers. Farming, except on the huge commercial enterprises, is still a family way of life though the product of the family farm is decreasing as the commercial farm products increase.

Annual averages of farm wage rates for all specified hiring arrangements were up moderately in 1963 in all States. The hourly wage rate, without room and board, was \$1.05 per hour. It was less than \$1 an hour in 12 Southern States and in New Mexico and West Virginia. It exceeded \$1.25 an hour in nine States.

Profitable farming has become big business. The family farm more often than not is a marginal operation, sustained by a combination of farm and factory work. Those who stay on the farm do so both out of love of the life and fear of the alternatives.

### Filipinos View the Peace Corps

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1964

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I inserted a statement on the award of the Philippines Presidential Golden Heart to Director Sargent Shriver of the Peace Corps, and included the citation and speech which accompanied the presentation.

Today, as a sequel to those remarks, I should like to include two editorials from Philippine newspapers on the Peace Corps. They indicate the kind of approval that this U.S. "people-to-people" aid program is meeting around the world:

[From the Manila Evening News, Feb. 26, 1964]

#### GOLDEN HEART FOR SHRIVER

When Amelito R. Mutuc, Philippine Ambassador to the United States, pinned the Golden Heart Presidential Award yesterday on Sargent Shriver, Director of the Peace Corps, he was merely giving formal expression to what millions of his countrymen feel about the Peace Corps.

There is no denying that the young Americans who have come to the Philippines did—and continue to do—a superb job as good will ambassadors. More than anything else, these dedicated men and women succeeded in erasing the unsavory impressions created by the ugly Americans in our midst. Their zeal and devotion, their willingness to sacrifice, and their genuine desire to help are obvious to all. By their work on the barrios and in the more inaccessible localities, the Peace Corps volunteers are giving the Filipinos a true picture of the American people and are sowing the seeds of friendship and understanding between the Philippines and the United States.

As the leader of these volunteers, Sargent Shriver epitomizes the spirit that energizes and activates this wonderful, praiseworthy group. The decoration that he received from

our grateful Government is inadequate thanks for all that the Peace Corps has done in this country. But the Golden Heart stands as an enduring, imperishable symbol of the appreciation that the Philippine people feel.

More important, the award stands for the esteem and respect of the Filipinos for the man who made the Peace Corps possible—the late, lamented President John F. Kennedy.

[From the Philippines Herald, Sunday, Nov. 24, 1963]

#### "KENNEDY'S CORPS" AS NEW NAME FOR PEACE CORPS

The one great and overriding obsession of the late President John F. Kennedy was to promote the cause of peace throughout the world. Even early in his campaign for the U.S. Presidency, he already gave an intimation of his great feeling in this regard when he singled out the challenge of peace as the on challenge on the New Frontier which cuts across all other challenges—the one problem which overshadows all other problems.

#### GREATEST CHALLENGE

"We are not satisfied with so-called peace that is merely an interval between two wars," he said. "We want a peace in which the funds now poured into the destructive forces of armaments may be channeled into the constructive results of disarmament—into great multinational efforts to eradicate disease, harness rivers, eliminate illiteracy and exploit the frontiers of space."

When Kennedy assumed the U.S. Presidency, one of the first important acts of his administration was to create the Peace Corps—an organization of volunteer workers for peace. This organization has since made its impact felt around the world.

Today, Peace Corps volunteers are found in almost every section of the world, particularly in undeveloped or underdeveloped areas, extending to people the benefits of their skills in various tasks and occupations and helping promote and enhance feelings of friendship and goodwill. The Philippines has its share of these volunteer workers and the Filipino people have nothing but the highest praise and admiration for their selfless dedication to their mission. Not a few of these ambassadors of peace and goodwill had died in accidents or adversity while performing their good work.

#### FITTING TRIBUTE

The Peace Corps perhaps best symbolizes the late President's great love for peace and dedication to its cause. Nothing could be more fitting, therefore, than that its name should now be changed to Kennedy's Corps, by way of tribute to Kennedy's labors for peace, if not to set the organization itself in a more meaningful perspective. Let the world henceforth identify this worthy effort with the name of the man who made it possible—the man whose one great obsession in life was to see all the peoples of the world joined in brotherhood and peace.

### Voice of Democracy Contest

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1964

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I wish to insert the winning speech submitted by contestants in the State of Connecticut in the Voice of Democracy Contest conducted by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. The speech entered by the winner, Miss Elizabeth Parkhurst, Meadow Lark Dairy Farm, Chestnut Hill, Conn., reads as follows:

#### THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

The word "citizenship" refers to the state of being a citizen; that is, being entitled to certain rights and privileges and fulfilling the reciprocal responsibilities. The full meaning of citizenship involves not only rights but also responsibilities. No conception of citizenship is valid that refuses to recognize this paradox.

The rights and responsibilities linked with American citizenship are familiar to everyone. The citizen of the United States has the freedom to work where he pleases, worship as he pleases, say what he wants to say, and think what he wants to think. He has the right to choose his own leaders and to disagree with them. He is guaranteed protection in time of war, and he is guaranteed an open trial when he is accused.

He has the responsibility to vote, to support the political party of his choice and its ideals, to serve in the Armed Forces (if he meets certain qualifications), and to protect his Constitution. The American citizen has the right to be free and the responsibility to assume his freedom.

Is the challenge of American citizenship related to these rights and responsibilities? Most certainly it is.

The real challenge of citizenship is the challenge for every American to find in himself the ability to allow all other Americans the freedom to fully enjoy the rights and responsibilities due his citizenship. The challenge of citizenship is the challenge for one man to recognize the humanity in all other men. Stated more simply, it is the challenge for every American to allow all other Americans to be Americans.

We practice religious freedom. We take pride in being able to worship as and if we want to. Yet have we never spoken harshly of a person whose religion is very different from ours? Have we never questioned a candidate on his religious convictions?

We believe that all races are equal. We hold fast to the conviction that all people should have equal rights and equal opportunities. We may look with disgust at prejudice in another part of the country; yet, do we not sometimes hesitate to sell property to a person of another race in our own town, for fear that property rates might go down?

We have always had free and open trials and impartial juries. We would expect nothing less for ourselves if we were accused, regardless of our guilt. We could serve quite impartially on the jury trying some anonymous citizen of petty theft, or even another citizen of grand larceny; but could we, could any American find it in himself to serve impartially on the jury that would have tried Lee Harvey Oswald, or that is to try Jack Ruby?

When, and only when, every American can find in himself the ability to allow every other American the freedom to fully enjoy the rights and responsibilities of citizenship, will the greatest challenge of citizenship be met and conquered. Then, and only then, will we truly have liberty and justice for all. Then, and only then, will the challenge of citizenship be less a challenge and more a fulfillment of being.

### Lithuanian Independence Day Address by Hon. Robert Taft, Jr., of Ohio

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. OLIVER P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, as he has in the past, my colleague from Ohio, the Honorable ROBERT TAFT, JR., has cut through the maze of Washington doubletalk concerning the issue of captive European nations. Celebrating Lithuanian Independence Day in Cleveland, Ohio, last Sunday, Congressman TAFT reiterated his belief that any impending political moves aimed at an eventual East-West detente not be at the expense of a further delay in granting independence to the millions of captive peoples in the Soviet bloc.

Congressman TAFT's remarks follow:

TEXT OF ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR., OF OHIO, LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY CELEBRATION

Mr. Chairman, members of the clergy, Dr. Backis, distinguished guests, and my Lithuanian friends of the Cleveland community, may I first thank you for the opportunity of sharing with you today this celebration of Lithuanian Independence Day. I am honored and pleased more than I can say to have this opportunity of joining you on such a joyous yet solemn occasion. I know of my father's previous appearances here with your group; and I know of his interest in the problems of your country, of your problems in this country, and of his warmth and his concern for this community and your part in it. I also wish to thank you for the most enjoyable singing, and Dr. Backis for what I am sure were most kind remarks. The language barrier, at least at the outset, prevented me from enjoying them as fully as I might have.

This, of course, is the 46th anniversary of your independence and I understand that it is also over 700 years since Lithuania became a separate state. Thus, this month you celebrate many anniversaries which I am sure are dear to you and the object of your deep devotion. Lithuania as a country, of course, is more than 500 years older than our own United States, and it is significant that during the last few days I have been circulating around the State of Ohio helping to celebrate the birthday of one of our greatest Americans, Abraham Lincoln. President Lincoln was an American devoted to the principles of freedom for which I know you stand for your nation and for all people. Slavery is slavery in any language, by any name in any area of the world. This is something that Americans have recognized and must continue to recognize regardless of their ancestry or we will have lost the great mission and the great heritage that has come to this country. While this Nation has been dedicated in the past to freedom for its citizens, we have not overlooked the importance of freedom throughout the world. This latter ideal is one to which we must and will firmly adhere.

Your organization, by its very nature, is concerned with problems of Lithuania and problems of Lithuanians in this country.

But I am sure the problems with which you are dealing and the purposes to which you are dedicated, you recognize have even wider scope. Unfortunately, during the last year we have seen the invidious spread of Communist activity with its resultant tyranny from Cuba into Central America, Panama, Brazil, and Venezuela; from China into Laos, Vietnam, and Cambodia; and most recently, from sources that to some extent at least we can identify as originating in our own hemisphere, into Zanzibar and Tanganyika. The cancerous growth that started in Eastern Europe has thus spread throughout the world and faces us all as citizens of the world with major decisions and a major responsibility that we must not and cannot forget.

The tragedy of Lithuania in 1940 was only a forerunner of deeper tragedies yet to come and it still stands as a warning on this, your Independence Day, to those who would let down our guard toward the threats that we face from the Communist menace. It is to the credit of your group, and indeed of the groups that represent all of the captive nations in the United States, that you will not allow this to happen; you will not forget. You bring to our minds continuously what has happened in history, and, indeed, if we are to make progress in the future, we must learn from the lessons of history.

At the outset, let me make it clear to you that I do not consider myself an expert in the areas that we discuss today. But I nevertheless welcome the opportunity to visit and to talk with you because I feel that your problems are problems that should greatly concern all America. Our heritage, our beliefs and our interests are deeply involved with the Baltic and eastern European states and their ultimate freedom. In the case of the Baltic states, we recognize that they stand in a special category in that there is absolutely no color of right to hold these nations in subservience. The principle of self-determination for which Americans have stood from the very beginning of our country has never been more flagrantly violated than in your case. Your state is not even a puppet. Your state has been completely absorbed; swallowed up (or attempted to be swallowed up) within the Communist bloc.

In speaking about this problem, perhaps I feel so strongly about it because I recall, as some of you may know, that my father's first connection with this matter came very close to the time of your independence in 1918. He was a member of the Relief Commission under Mr. Hoover and worked in the Eastern European States, the Baltic States, Finland, and Hungary. I know that nothing gave him more pride than the accomplishments that we were able to achieve in Europe at that time. Even today I find that while I may still be thought of as young by some people, I certainly don't so consider myself when I realize that I have a son who is today in Africa serving in the Peace Corps in Tanganyika in the very area where the Communist menace is again threatening.

What I would like to talk to you about today is what should be the foreign policy of the United States with regard to the captive nations. I believe these policies should be constantly in our view and subject to our examination and reexamination. It is my belief that the primary role we as American citizens can play is to demand and obtain a clarification of the thinking of this country on the matter of our attitude toward the captive nations. This clarification should come from the President and from the Secretary of State. It should be examined and tested in the crucible of public opinion of the people of the United States. The broader